



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

brought this warning home to all—and all of us need it. One example must serve. On Revival of Learning and Renaissance, see pp. 15, 36–37, 39, 112, 113, 149, 150, 163–165, 182, 185, 194, 205. The dogmatic flavor of the book, taken as a whole, is probably the by-product of unavoidable brevity. The reviewer offers the same plea for his review.

G. C. SELLERY.

Histoire de la Nation Française. Par GABRIEL HANOTAUX, de l'Académie Française. Tome VI. *Histoire Religieuse*. Par GEORGES GOYAU. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1922. Pp. 639. 48 fr.)

If the principles of eugenics are valid for life, why not also for letters? If a child may be “well-born”, why not also a book? However that may be, and whatever the theoretical limits of scientific mating and breeding, the volume that lies before us is the offspring of a perfect union of author and subject. To write the religious history of France no happier choice could have been made than the scholar whose profound and comprehensive studies, extending over more than a quarter of a century, have established his pre-eminence in his special field. And to this scholar could have been assigned no more congenial task than to trace for his fellow-countrymen the long course of their religious life. One can well believe that it were no task, but a labor of love, a kind of votive offering, the spontaneous outpouring of a feeling in which the religious and the patriotic are perfectly blended.

For to M. Goyau religion and patriotism are one and inseparable—for the reason that the genius of France expresses itself, and has always expressed itself, in a passion for the universal. “Chez les Druides qui pressentent et préparent, et chez Irénée qui révèle; chez Calvin qui ‘proteste’, et chez Comte qui nie, même souci de l’universel. N’est-ce pas un des traits les plus frappants du génie religieux de la France?” (p. 619). France must be religious, for in religion alone does the idea of the universal find adequate expression. And France must be Catholic, for Catholicism alone embodies the universal in religion. “Si haut que nous remontions dans notre histoire, une affinité s’entrevoit entre nos âmes et l’idée d’une religion universelle” (p. 617). From the days of St. Remi and Boniface to the days of Chateaubriand and de Maistre, all roads have led to Rome. No false guides have been able permanently to seduce France from that path. Even her occasional lapses into Gallicanism are due to passing irritation, rather than to design; at bottom, they are manifestations of the same ineradicable instinct for unity and universality that made and kept France Catholic. Charles the Great might make a “Gallican gesture”, but he was no Gallican, or, if so, unwittingly and unintentionally (pp. 125, 136); Hincmar might stand for the rights of the metropolitan, but as over against the bishops, rather than as against the pope (p. 150); St. Louis might arraign the

clergy, but before the tribunal of conscience, not before the throne (p. 269); the bishops might support Philip IV. against Boniface VIII., but from motives prudential, not upon grounds dogmatic (pp. 274-275); the efforts of d'Ailly and Gerson were bent toward unity, not toward independence (pp. 298-303); Richelieu's concern was quite as much for the integrity of the Church, as for the supremacy of the crown (p. 400); even the Declaration of 1682 is to be understood as a theological formula, more or less felicitous, expressing the need for assurance of the independence of the monarchy (p. 446). "Royal Gallicanism", "Parliamentary Gallicanism", upon occasion, yes; but of "conscious, defined, ecclesiastical Gallicanism", scarcely a trace. Susceptible when the national autonomy is threatened; susceptible also when the religious unity is put in jeopardy; troubled when these two susceptibilities are at variance; contented when they are in harmony—such is the innate disposition of France (p. 618). For one vertiginous instant France did find herself schismatic (p. 449); but even then the heart of France was Catholic, as the Concordat proved (pp. 535, 618). In the face of heretic, reformer, Parliamentarian, Revolutionist, even Separatist, France has steadfastly held her way and maintained her vital touch with Rome.

But it is not only as the "fille ainée de l'Église" that M. Goyau would have us see France, but also as the "ouvrière de Dieu", fulfilling her "vocation religieuse", through monk and missionary and crusader, by theologian and teacher and master-builder. And what a splendid panorama he unfolds! Cluny, Chartreuse, Prémontré, Prouille, Montmartre—what mighty forces have these cradled and sent forth! What lines have gone forth to the ends of the world, from Paris and St. Victor and Clairvaux! What does not Catholic theology and worship owe to France!—the doctrines of transubstantiation and the Immaculate Conception, the Ave Maria and the elevation of the host, the cult of the Virgin (pp. 216-217)? As for the debt of Christian art, let Reims stand for the whole.

And in this apostolate, hand in hand with the Church has marched the State. "L'alliance entre la France politique et la France missionnaire . . . survit à toutes les vicissitudes politiques" (p. 620). What! even the rupture of 1905? Yes, even that, predicts M. Goyau: "On sentira renaitre, entre la France officielle et l'Église, l'esprit de concorde et de collaboration morale" (p. 602).

It is a splendid and majestic pageant that M. Goyau has produced, a work of consummate artistry. But, if one may venture to criticize a masterpiece, *as a history*, it suffers from a too limited interpretation of its scope—it is too exclusively "religious". For though religion may be regarded as a phase of life, it is in fact an integral part of life, influencing, and reciprocally influenced by, all the other vital elements and forces. And religious history cannot be adequately written by sifting out the "religious" and ignoring the rest. Least of all can this be done in the case of France where, as M. Goyau himself insists, religion is of

the very fibre of the national life. And yet this is the method that M. Goyau has pursued, quite rigorously confining himself to the "religious", in the restricted sense of the word, and relegating the political, the economic, the social, to his collaborators. This is perfectly legitimate in view of the prearranged division of labor; but the result is none the less unfortunate. If religion embodies itself in a church, and if, as in France, the Church has been immemorially bound up with the State, how can one justly interpret the religious without recourse to the political? How partial and inadequate must be an exclusively "religious" exposition of, say, the Cluniac movement, or *Unam Sanctam*, or the Councils, or the Reformation and Religious Wars, or the Restoration and Ultramontanism—to cite but some of the most conspicuous instances of M. Goyau's rather scant regard for the political determinants in religious developments. When this process is applied to historical portraiture, the result is nothing less than distortion. Imagine the face of Richelieu with all the political wrinkles smoothed out! or Joan of Arc with an aureole but no oriflamme, a conventional saint whose title to immortality rests, not upon having beaten back the English, but upon having saved the Faith! (pp. 313, 399 ff.). Rather unfamiliar like-nesses, these.

But as for the portrait of France herself, *la France Religieuse*—well, an artist can but paint as he sees. M. Goyau has seen with an eye of love and reverence, and has limned the features of his *douce France* with devotion and sincerity. The figure on his canvas is one of great dignity and strength, with a face of mature and serene beauty.

THEODORE COLLIER.

Arabic Thought and its Place in History. By DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D., Lecturer in Aramaic and Syriac, Bristol University. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, and Company; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1922. Pp. viii, 320. 10s. 6d.)

MR. O'LEARY seeks to accomplish three main things: in the first place, to describe the transmission of Hellenistic thought by Syriac-, Arabic-, and Hebrew-speaking authors; secondly, to note any developments which it may have received from these; and thirdly, to state the influence which it exercised on Muslim and Christian theology and mysticism. By Hellenistic thought is meant chiefly the logic, physics, and metaphysics of Aristotle, his psychology as interpreted by Alexander of Aphrodisias and the Neo-Platonists, the Plotinian system of philosophy especially as it appears in the so-called "Theology of Aristotle", and the medical writings of Galen, Dioscorus, and the Alexandrian school.

The author's treatment of this rather vast subject is very clear and his method of exposition is to be commended. His knowledge of it, if not always strictly accurate, is, on the whole, well balanced, and Mr.